



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

has not written a military history of the Rebellion. Judging not only from these essays, but from his well-known reputation, he is one of the few men who are well fitted for the task.

---

11. — *The Life and Death of John of Barneveld, Advocate of Holland; with a View of the Primary Causes and Movements of the Thirty Years' War.* By JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY, D. C. L., LL. D. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1874. 2 vols.

WHETHER these volumes indicate any modification of a purpose that Mr. Motley has more than once expressed, we are not informed. When the earlier portion of the "History of the United Netherlands" was published, some fourteen years ago, the author announced his intention, at some future time, of retracing the story of that great struggle which was brought to a close by the Treaty of Westphalia. The two concluding volumes were accompanied with the gratifying statement that he was already engaged upon the work which he regarded as the natural complement to all his previous labors. Whatever considerations have prompted the present departure from his original design, we earnestly trust that they are not of a nature to cast any doubt upon the completion of the History, the promise of which has been so long held out. The Thirty Years' War would tax his highest powers; and however hearty the satisfaction with which any production of Mr. Motley's pen is hailed, on both sides the water, it would unquestionably awaken a deeper sorrow to know that anything forbade the prosecution of that crowning work for which the labors of his life have so admirably fitted him. Every reader of these volumes will notice with regret that the Preface makes but a guarded allusion to any future purpose.

While "The Life and Death of Barneveld" forms a sequel to the "History of the United Netherlands," covering as it does the period of the Twelve Years' Truce, yet it would seem from the title chosen by the author that it is not meant precisely as a continuation of that work. Although carrying on, in the main, the same story, it is yet made so much to set forth the career and fate of a single character, and is so liberally illustrated with personal anecdote, and flavored with such piquant details of domestic intrigue, that it deserves to be classed rather with memoirs than with histories. Its picturesque and dramatic coloring continually reminds us of those inimitable works which are the characteristic product of French genius, and which Mr. Motley has evidently studied with such keen appreciation.

This apparent intention of the author explains a certain discursiveness of method, which, judged by a more rigid rule, might be reckoned a defect. For it is only with the second volume that Barneveld becomes the central figure. The hero of the first is rather the brilliant sovereign, — hero, statesman, lover, — whom Mr. Motley terms with truth “the only king in Europe.” After a rapid sketch of Barneveld’s career up to the conclusion of the Truce, in which the origin of the fatal rivalry between him and Prince Maurice is explained, the author places the relations of the leading European states clearly before us in a detailed and graphic narrative of the events consequent upon the death of the crazy Duke of Cleve. Though the possessions of this potentate were only paltry, yet he contrived, “by leaving everybody his heir,” as Henry curtly stated the case to Sully, to set all his neighbors by the ears. The difficult questions involved in the Cleve succession, the nature of the rival claims, the intimate bearing of the dispute upon the fortunes of the young commonwealth which had just succeeded, after so many years of strife, in winning an unstable foothold among the family of nations, are all explained with admirable clearness, and at the same time with a vivacity that redeems the somewhat minute recital from the least reproach of dryness. The unwearied efforts of the States, through their keen-witted and accomplished ambassador at Paris, to commit Henry to an alliance in support of the Possessory Princes, furnishes the author with an opportunity of bringing upon the scene a monarch for whom his admiration is never grudgingly expressed. Whether the clear understanding of the difficulties with which Barneveld had to grapple, at this juncture, required that Mr. Motley should give with such fulness of detail the story of that strange, unworthy passion for the beautiful Margaret de Montmorency which covered the closing years of the hero of Ivry with so much shame, the critic perhaps might question, though we presume that no reader of these volumes would wish the sparkling episode left out. The Duc d’Aumale, who in his *History of the Princes of Condé*, tells the same story with far less effect, insists that it is a mistake to think that this amorous caprice of the gray-bearded monarch either prompted or modified his foreign policy; but Mr. Motley claims that “the abduction of the new Helen,” if not the cause of the impending Iliad, had yet a direct and important bearing on the hostilities so soon to be commenced. The political significance of this royal comedy has no doubt been overstated, yet Mr. Motley makes it plain that Condé’s flight roused Henry to a new sense of the need of maintaining friendly relations with the States. Everything, however, was thrown into confusion by the

dagger of Ravallac. Henry, if not always a sincere, had been for the most part a steady friend to the sturdy commonwealth which had so often fought his battles against the common foe, but the miserable clique that now ruined France looked across the Pyrenees for inspiration and support. An ancient Leaguer held all the threads of foreign alliance in his hands. Still the young Republic proved equal to the task thus unexpectedly imposed upon her. With little to hope for, either from France or England, she did not falter. Barneveld, who inspired her counsels, now becomes the foremost figure; but with his vigorous and successful conduct of this crisis, his influence so long exercised in Holland without restraint began rapidly to wane. The seeds of discord between the Stadtholder and himself, which had secretly been ripening, now bore their fruit. The brief campaign in Cleve and Jülich was the last enterprise in which they acted even in apparent harmony. The manifold elements of the fatal combination which was now formed against him, the long-smothered enmity of Maurice, the crafty hatred of Francis Aerssens, the more out-spoken hostility of Dudley Carleton, the malignant suspicions engendered by religious differences, the implacable antagonism of national and provincial interests, the struggle for supremacy between Church and State, were rapidly weaving around the aged statesman a network of calumnies beside which his forty years of patriotic service were destined to count as nothing. Mr. Motley paints with great sympathy and power the picture of the undaunted Advocate slowly and unwillingly awakening to a perception of the real difficulties of his position, but refusing to bend in the slightest before the rising storm, and holding to the last his attitude of conscious innocence and stern defiance. We scarcely recall, in the whole range of English historical literature, so firmly drawn and effective a delineation. Possibly the contemplation of a statesman and diplomatist thus rudely crushed beneath the mailed hand of a successful soldier lends emphasis to some of Mr. Motley's strokes. In vivid contrast, as they faced each other for the last grapple, are drawn the two men by whom the fortunes of the Republic had been so long upheld, — the stern, gray-bearded Advocate, haggard and bent with years of care, wrapped in velvet cloak and leaning on his staff; and the thick-set, fiery Prince, still in vigorous manhood, clad in brown doublet and big russet boots, with his shabby hat and his famous gold-hilted sword. The trial of the Advocate is given at length, most of it from unpublished sources, and the final scene in the Binnenhof is described in almost the vivid language of an eyewitness. But we will not follow further a story with which most of our readers must by this time be familiar.

Some, perhaps, will deplore the absence, in these volumes, of those striking features which so much heightened the interest of Mr. Motley's former works. His subject here requires him to deal with different themes. We are carried from the camp to the tribunal of justice; from the battle-field to the less picturesque arena of legal and theological debate. We miss, of necessity, the familiar heroic figures of an earlier epoch. The Cleve campaign seems a small affair after the wars of William of Orange. Aerssens and Uytenbogaert hardly replace Egmont and Sainte Aldegonde. Henry IV. appears for a time, but not in his most imposing attitude. The great Spinola sinks into a carpet knight. Maurice himself, whose part is so important, moves darkly across a stage where his supreme qualities have little scope for action. There are no chapters like those which picture so vividly the weird phases of the siege of Antwerp, or the stubborn tenacity of purpose that wrested victory from defeat on the sands of Nieuport. The central figure is a civilian whose life-work was done in the cabinet or in the council-chamber, the monument of whose victories consists in vast piles of "exasperating manuscript" which for generations have slept undisturbed; the struggle involves no longer the liberties of a gallant people, but dry problems of theology and doubtful questions of constitutional law. At first sight nothing might seem less inviting than such a theme; yet Mr. Motley has clothed it with such living interest, coloring its abstract issues with such constant play of warm side-lights, and bringing into such strong relief, as the event unfolds, the clearly outlined features of the stern old man on whose head the pitiless storm is breaking, that he carries us to the close with unflagging interest. No one of his characters has so powerful a hold upon our human sympathies. The plot has all the simplicity of the ancient tragedy. We take in the whole of the narrow field, and follow without distraction the single thread. Our attention is absorbed because it is so concentrated. Even Mr. Motley's great hero, William the Silent, is hardly elaborated with more care. Next to Barneveld, his great antagonist the Stadtholder becomes the most conspicuous figure; and around these are grouped with great skill the lesser actors, sometimes, as in the case of Sully, analyzed in a pungent paragraph, sometimes, like the Emperor Rudolph, hit off with a single vigorous stroke. Of these subordinate sketches that of Francis Aerssens, the Dutch Ambassador at Paris, is perhaps the most effective. But the volumes are full of similar portraits which, if often far from flattering, are always lifelike and full of spirit. The young Grotius comes upon the stage only in the closing scenes, but the story of his escape from Loevestein reads like a chapter out of Walter Scott.

Nor does this conspicuous display of dramatic power constitute by any means the only literary attraction of these volumes. The author lights up his narrative at times with fine bits of landscape-painting, such as only a keen eye for natural scenery, and a familiar knowledge of the localities, could have produced. All who have read these pages will recall at once the passage in which he sketches the picturesque surroundings of the historic city which spans with its ancient, many-statued bridge the rushing Moldau, and the sunny touches that set before us, with such evident delight, the fair village-capital of Holland, with its old moated castle, its shady promenades, its lake fringed with weeping-willows and lilacs and laburnums, the white swans gliding over the silver basin, and the nightingales singing in the groves. The description of the Utrecht fair is in a different vein. The noisy *kermis*, with its jostling crowd of pedlers and quaintly costumed peasants, its mountebanks and merry-makings, its coarse and exuberant frolic, seems a study after Teniers.

But we are far from thinking that these patent characteristics of Mr. Motley's genius, to which we have called attention, are by any means the distinctive qualities on which he would prefer to have his reputation as an historian rest. Mr. Motley is more than a mere student of the past; untiring as have been his researches, he has never wholly buried himself in the dusty archives of Dresden and the Hague. He is also a man of the present, and his interest in all the great political problems of the day is earnest and intelligent. He looks at the past, not as a mere antiquary, but with constant reference to living issues. The work before us is undertaken in this spirit. The author tells us, at the outset, that it aims at being a political study; that describing as it does a complex struggle between national and provincial sovereignty, between ecclesiastical and civil power, it is full of lessons and warnings for all free states. The struggle is here revealed in the first considerable federal republic of modern times; hence the lessons taught have a special application to our own land. The system of Switzerland was too limited, that of Venice was too oligarchical, to yield us any profitable instruction; but between the Netherlands and ourselves there are many points in common. While the work covers a period of bitter religious controversy, including as it does the famous sessions of the Synod of Dort, Mr. Motley declines all discussion of the questions between the Arminians and their opponents. Beyond the flaming gates of the theological paradise he refuses to penetrate. Like Prince Maurice, he evidently does not care whether predestination be green or blue. He insists that the struggle, which so convulsed the States, was fundamentally political

and personal, although he allows that the most effective weapons were drawn from ecclesiastical arsenals. It is with reference to the political lessons to be learned that he has subjected to such minute analysis the working of individual humors and private passions. He is so much in earnest to vindicate the career of Barneveld, not for the tragic interest which enables it to be told with dramatic effect, but because the character of a great statesman is a possession of inestimable value to mankind. What, in short, Taine says of Macaulay, may be applied with stricter truth to Mr. Motley, that he writes history, not as an artist, but as a moralist. It is by the standard thus supplied that the author of these volumes would evidently wish to have his labors judged.

While it will not be questioned that this didactic quality adds greatly to the interest and impressiveness of Mr. Motley's writings, there is evident danger of its sliding at times into a defect. One can hardly have the moral of his story constantly in view, without coming at last to set an undue estimate upon its value. In the case before us, as we lay down these striking volumes, we are not quite certain that the author's absorption in his subject has not led him to magnify unconsciously its historical significance, and make Barneveld himself a somewhat more colossal figure than he is fairly entitled to be represented. We criticise with diffidence an estimate which is the result of so much study, and which rests upon grounds the full force of which Mr. Motley can appreciate so much better than any living man. When he assures us that the enormous masses of original papers which he has inspected bear silent but incontrovertible witness to the fact that the statesman whose own individuality was so completely veiled by the singular constitution of the Republic whose destinies he guided, was seen, heard, and obeyed by the great European public, by the monarchs and warriors of the time, the statement is one which we have neither the means nor the disposition to gainsay; but on the reasons for this estimate, so far as they are presented to his readers, we may, without presumption, venture to pass a judgment. Mr. Motley claims that the part played by the Advocate in European politics, during the period of the Truce, has never been appreciated. The Dutch statesman was really, at this time, he says, the central figure. Under his modest designation, he was virtually the prime minister of the Confederation, its president, attorney-general, minister of finance, and foreign secretary. The controlling influence of Holland gave him the first place in the ill-compacted system founded by the Union of Utrecht. Draped behind the States-General, his informing and master spirit shaped, more than

any other, the current of events ; he alone, of the statesmen of his age, foresaw clearly the frightful convulsion then impending. Language like this leaves in the reader's mind the lurking suspicion that the historian has unduly kindled with his theme. So far as he has aimed simply to vindicate the good name of Barneveld, his labors are a complete success. He has proved, beyond a doubt, that the main charge, so industriously circulated against the Advocate, of meditating a surrender of the States to Spain, was as absurd as it was malignant. The Advocate's whole career gave it the lie not less than his dying words. Nor has Mr. Motley rendered historical truth by any means a needless service in thus establishing the innocence of the ill-fated statesman, for there have not been wanting those in recent times, and in his own land, to justify the hard sentence passed against him. The historian has earned our warmest thanks for placing in a true light the venerable figure of the man who more than any other must be regarded as founder of the Dutch Republic. But when he goes beyond this, and insists on having us believe that without the master-touch of Barneveld the record, not of Holland only, but of France, Spain, Britain, Germany as well, might have been modified in essential aspects ; when he ascribes, as he does so often, to the Advocate the possession of consummate genius and unrivalled insight ; when he affirms that the history of Europe, the fate of Christendom, is in his correspondence ; above all, when he terms Barneveld the prime minister of European Protestantism, its statesman and prophet, with none to rival, few to comprehend, and fewer to sustain him, — we cannot help asking whether his achievements, even in the light of Mr. Motley's own elaborate and eloquent delineation, are sufficient to justify such praise. We cannot help suspecting that the enthusiastic student of these vast piles of manuscript has made the untiring industry of Barneveld too much the measure of his actual influence. We recall the fact that this stupendous shape, whose bulk now stretches so far over the vexed sea of European politics, has been described by Mr. Motley, in more measured terms, as a tough, hard-headed burgher statesman, with nothing heroic in his nature ; as not above playing tricks at times ; as loving his country well, but power still better ; as swayed by provincial instincts ; as champion of that least imposing form of aristocracy, an oligarchy of selfish traders ; as content to be perpetual chairman of a board of ambitious shopkeepers ; as one whose imperious but narrow understanding was incapable of comprehending the meaning of religious freedom ; who was willing to intrust the decision of man's relations to his Maker to the decree of a trading corporation. Of course no one would make it a reproach



against Mr. Motley that his earlier estimate has been modified by fuller research, and that the study of the Advocate's vast correspondence should have revealed more clearly the influential though silent part he played ; but the facts in Barneveld's career, as they are presented in these volumes, hardly make him the master-spirit that the historian has conjured up. Henry held him in high esteem, but Sully, than whom was no shrewder judge, seems to have questioned his political astuteness in the most important transaction of his life. It was only during the Cleve negotiations that his hand was powerfully felt outside the Netherlands. The sharp bargain he drove with James was rather proof of a crafty than a capacious understanding. If he foresaw, as no doubt did others, the fierce storm that threatened Europe, he was able to do nothing to avert it. Resolute and honest, he remained provincial to the last. He laid down his life for local rights and corporate privilege. In the final struggle his stand was that of a lawyer more than of a statesman. We acknowledge that he was illegally condemned ; we regard his pretended trial as a mockery of justice ; we are impressed with his stoical courage : but we cannot attribute the highest insight to a statesman so apparently indifferent to the deepest forces which then convulsed society ; still less can we apply the title of prime minister and prophet of Protestantism to one who in that age could adopt the prudent motto, savoring so much more of Montaigne than of Martin Luther, "*Nil scire tutissima fides.*" He strikes us, on the contrary, as a firmly knit but not finely tempered nature ; of powerful but narrow understanding ; of obstinate disposition and unyielding prejudices ; blindly precipitating a contest in which he could not fail to be worsted. He paid the hard penalty of despising popular sentiment. He acted fearlessly according to his convictions, and died as he had lived ; but with all that Mr. Motley urges in his behalf, we still fail to be persuaded that he was ever a very great or always a very wise man.

We are also in doubt as to the precise political lesson meant to be deduced from the Advocate's career. Mr. Motley tells us that it is a lesson addressed especially to our land and age, teaching the dangers to which a federal system is exposed. But Barneveld died the unflinching advocate of a narrow theory of state rights. "Logic, law, historical tradition," to quote Mr. Motley's own words, "were on the side of the Advocate and the states-right party. The instincts of national self-preservation, repudiating the narrow and destructive doctrine of provincial sovereignty, were on the side of the States-General and the Church." Surely it is not for maintaining such a position, and at such a crisis, that the Advocate is held up before us as a

consummate statesman. Or is Barneveld, in this aspect of his career, meant to be regarded as a warning, as illustrating the peril of pushing to excess the theory of local sovereignties? At times the language of the author would seem to imply this. But we, in this country, need hardly go so far to learn this wholesome yet familiar lesson. And if this be the moral meant to be drawn from Barneveld's career, we are at a loss to know why, as a statesman, he should be so commended.

But beneath this question of national or provincial sovereignty there was involved another. It was the old question which has agitated Christendom since the day when Constantine gave the Church a legal recognition; the question with which the Middle Ages ring, which the Reformation raised afresh, and which to-day is agitating Europe more deeply than any other, — the question of the relation of Church and State. Barneveld himself, disinclined as he was to theological speculation, recognized it as one of the vital problems of the age. On this question the Reformed or Calvinistic churches had always held consistent ground. According to the theory of their great founder, the Church of Christ was complete within itself; no external power had a right to impose upon it dogma, discipline, or ministry; the functions of the civil magistrate ceased at the threshold of the sanctuary. To a national synod lay the ultimate ecclesiastical appeal. On the other hand, it was claimed by Barneveld, and this was the view which prevailed throughout Germany and England, that the supreme right of regulating church affairs belonged to the civil power, that is, in the Netherlands, to the provincial States and to self-electing municipal corporations. He looked upon questions of dogma as subordinate to questions of ecclesiastical administration; in other words, he deemed it of less importance to solve the problem of predestination than to settle who should appoint the parish schoolmaster. To all claims of the churches to regulate their own affairs, the Advocate had but one reply: "To my Lords the States-General every right belonged." It was for the Netherlanders to decide, says Mr. Motley, whether, after having shaken off the Holy Inquisition, they were now to submit to the imperious claims of the new church. May we not say in answer, using in part Mr. Motley's own expressive language, whether, having shaken off the Pope, they were now to intrust the direction of their spiritual concerns "to a board of ambitious shopkeepers"? We do not find the least fault with Barneveld for not rising superior to his age. The question was beset with difficulties. Mr. Motley presents these difficulties with great force and clearness. If shopkeepers were hardly fit to become foster-fathers of the

Church, neither were furious fanatics. There were strong arguments in favor of Barneveld's view. But we must hesitate to accord him an exceptional rank for upholding a thesis which was the commonplace of every petty prince who swilled beer and robbed churches, and shouted, "*Cujus regio, ejus religio.*"

The portion of Mr. Motley's work where he seems to us to have labored with least success is in tracing the final stages of the struggle between Barneveld and Prince Maurice. For the illustrious son of William the Silent his admiration is undisguised. Next to Henry IV., Maurice had been, during the war, the most considerable personage in Europe. Nothing like his sieges, his campaigning, his discipline, had been seen before. He had fought with unsurpassed address and valor the most brilliant pitched battle of the age. He was the acknowledged master of the most royal of all sciences. Mr. Motley touches lightly upon the license of his private life, and though never a eulogist of formal piety, calls attention to the fact that the Prince was punctual in attendance upon public worship, and that he listened with patience to the discussion of religious truth. He claims for Maurice, what no doubt was true, that while he cared nothing for mere speculative questions of theology, he was sincerely disposed to support the tenets which his father had so earnestly embraced, and that his convictions fully coincided with his interests when he placed himself at the head of the Contra Remonstrant party. Mr. Motley also insists, and here too every intelligent reader of these volumes will go with him, that Maurice was guilty of no crime in aspiring to sovereign power. His father had been offered the throne of Holland, and his own personal qualifications and public services were certainly not of a nature to lessen, in the least, his claim to the same distinction. The Netherlands had not been a republic before the war; they had gradually drifted into one, not from choice, but because they could not find a king. In the weakly jointed confederation established by the Union of Utrecht, and in the threatening aspect of foreign politics, there were many reasons why a sincere patriot should favor a closer league. Should the office of Stadtholder be exchanged for that of Sovereign Count, there could be but one possible candidate for the position. At an earlier epoch Barneveld himself had strongly urged Maurice for this position. The Advocate afterwards took a very different view; but we can well understand how Maurice, burning with the recollection of that fearful day when his matchless skill had alone saved the Republic from the complete overthrow to which the obstinacy of Barneveld had exposed it, should have felt the peril of allowing campaigns to be directed any longer by civilians.

Mr. Motley states, with much fairness, the causes of the unhappy rivalry between the Advocate and Stadtholder. Dismissing as unworthy the least credit the oft-repeated stories of personal insult, he shows how they naturally and honestly came to be opposed. The division of sentiment respecting the Twelve Years' Truce left them the recognized leaders of two opposing factions, in which elements of religious as well as of political discord were combined. Up to this point all is clear, and the relations of the two antagonists present no difficulty. They were chiefs of rival parties, bitterly opposed, and the success of one would of necessity involve the political annihilation of the other. But deposition from office, or at most a not dishonorable exile, would seem to be the worst possible result of such a state of things. The Advocate himself, when his hour was darkest, appears to have anticipated nothing more severe. What influence was it that prompted the sudden arrest, and refused to mitigate the final sentence? The historian leaves us quite in the dark as to the secret forces that were here at work. He drops hints, but gives us no full explanation. It is to be regretted that his indefatigable research did not discover the solution of these questions. The Stadtholder certainly was not a cruel, neither was he a revengeful man. Deeply angered he no doubt was, but, with the great body of the nation at his heels, he had nothing further to fear from one so advanced in years and so unpopular as the Advocate. Nor is it easy to see what he had to gain from the death of one whose power was so completely broken. It seems a necessity to seek some other explanation of his course. Brave in action to a fault, the Prince was not always resolute of purpose. At times he was too much inclined to submit his own better judgment to the sway of others. In the memorable Nieuport campaign this want of decision showed itself in a striking manner. Is it not possible that here, too, his own purpose was overpowered; that when he seemed the instigator he was really the mere instrument; that he was forced beyond his original purpose of "a bloodless revolution," by the fierce zeal of the religious faction which supported him? This is Van Kampen's view, and it would have helped us much to trace the successive steps of this dark tragedy had Mr. Motley's researches tended to confirm it. In aiming at a political study of this period, Mr. Motley was fully justified in declining to enter upon the vexed questions which divided the theologians of Dort. Those who care for such discussions may find them fully reported in other works. We are grateful to Mr. Motley for giving us such clear insight into a controversy which has been known to the English reader only in the dreary folios of Brandt. But we cannot help

thinking that, in avoiding one extreme, he has gone too far into the other, and has hardly given prominence enough to the religious element in this great struggle. Mr. Motley, we are aware, holds strongly to the view which Secretary Lake expressed to Carleton, "that under the name of religion a civil end was shadowed"; but granting the correctness of this opinion, we still think that had he more carefully worked up the dark religious background of his canvas, some portions now indistinct might have been thrown into a clearer light. Certainly we rise from Brandt with the impression that the furious passions engendered by theological debate had a more direct connection with the final issue than Mr. Motley represents. That was a significant saying which Brandt somewhere quotes, that when Barneveld was called, in derision, the new John the Baptist, the retort was, — because his head had been presented in a charger to the Synod as a reward for having danced after the pipe of Herod. And skilful and interesting as Mr. Motley's treatment of his subject unquestionably is, and valuable and extensive as are his original contributions to our knowledge of this period, it may still be doubted whether somewhat less contempt for theological differences would not have added to his qualifications.

Of a writer of Mr. Motley's established reputation for untiring research it is scarcely necessary to add, that no source of information seems to have been overlooked. If he has left some questions still unsettled, we may infer that it was for the reason that the grounds for forming an opinion nowhere existed. As with his former publications, a large and most essential part of his material is derived from unpublished documents. The vast collection of letters, state papers, and minutes of judicial proceedings, so carefully preserved at the Hague, above all, the copious correspondence of Barneveld himself, have all been thrown open to his prolonged inspection. Among them were papers of the highest interest relating to the trial, which in consequence of an oath taken by the judges were long hidden from human view. The negotiations with England are illustrated from manuscripts preserved at Hatfield House. Printed authorities have also been diligently searched, though only in a single chapter does the author rely exclusively upon them.

In point of style these volumes compare favorably with Mr. Motley's other works. They have the marked characteristics with which we are so familiar. They show no falling off in brilliancy and vigor. A minute criticism might detect an infrequent sentence that seems involved, or an expression which a more delicate taste would slightly tone. A fault of which we feel more inclined to make complaint is

a trick of iteration which seldom allows a leading character to come upon the stage without a label setting forth his claims to our attention. We hardly need to be so continually reminded that Barneveld was the brain and Maurice the sword of the confederacy. But these are petty blemishes, which a little more careful revision would easily remove. We have no mind to hunt them out in pages that have yielded us so much instruction and so much delight. If at times Mr. Motley's writing seems slightly overstrained, and at times too vehement and rough, it has the supreme merit of being the counterpart of his thought. He always writes as he feels. His style, when most faulty, is forcible and racy; it goes straight to the mark; and, however unmusical, never lacks the sonorous ring of genuine metal. Had he written no other work than the present, he would have taken rank with the foremost historical investigators of our time; but when we remember the long series of volumes with which he has enriched our literature, volumes which have done so much to kindle our love of rational liberty, and confirm our faith in free institutions, we have no adequate words to express our admiration and gratitude.

---

12. — *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams, comprising Portions of his Diary from 1795 to 1848.* Edited by CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS. Vol. II. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1874.

ALL that the reviewer can do at present, as these volumes rapidly follow one another, fresh from the press, is to point out in the briefest possible language the points in which each is likely to be considered as historically important. All effective criticism of the general character and ultimate value of the publication must be postponed until its completion.

The present volume opens to view for the first time the establishment of that policy of friendly relations between the United States and Russia which was intended to serve, and which has in fact served, as a check to the domination of Great Britain on the ocean.

This idea was first started by the Count de Vergennes soon after the alliance made by France with the American insurgents, and issued in that combination of the Northern powers under the lead of Catherine II., which has ever since been known under the name of the Armed Neutrality. Their declaration, made in 1780, at once roused the attention of both Great Britain and the American States. The latter immediately instituted a mission to St. Petersburg, and sent out Francis Dana as a diplomatic envoy to promote the move-